

**This Page is Inserted by IFW Indexing and Scanning  
Operations and is not part of the Official Record**

**BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES**

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images include but are not limited to the items checked:

- ☐ **BLACK BORDERS**
- ☐ **IMAGE CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES**
- ☐ **FADED TEXT OR DRAWING**
- ☐ **BLURRED OR ILLEGIBLE TEXT OR DRAWING**
- ☐ **SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES**
- ☐ **COLOR OR BLACK AND WHITE PHOTOGRAPHS**
- ☐ **GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS**
- ☐ **LINES OR MARKS ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT**
- ☐ **REFERENCE(S) OR EXHIBIT(S) SUBMITTED ARE POOR QUALITY**
- ☐ **OTHER:** \_\_\_\_\_

**IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.**

**As rescanning these documents will not correct the image problems checked, please do not report these problems to the IFW Image Problem Mailbox.**



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/987,478	11/14/2001	John M. Cruz	P 273247 P10301	7054
909	7590	08/12/2004	EXAMINER	
PILLSBURY WINTHROP, LLP			VO, TED T	
P.O. BOX 10500			ART UNIT	
MCLEAN, VA 22102			PAPER NUMBER	

2122

DATE MAILED: 08/12/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/987,478

Applicant(s)

CRUZ ET AL.

Examiner

Ted T. Vo

Art Unit

2122

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 November 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,4-14,16,17 and 19-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 3,15 and 18 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**DETAILED ACTION**

1. This action is in response to the communications filed on 11/14//2001.  
Claims 1-21 are pending in the application.

***Drawings***

2. Figures 1, 9, and 11 of the drawings, are objected to by Examiner. The labels/descriptions within darkened boxes in these Figures are not readable. Correction is required.

***Specification***

3. The specification of the disclosure is objected to because it does not comply with the guidelines in MPEP.

The Brief Description of The Drawings section fails to include the brief descriptions of Figures 13-17 (MPEP 608.01(f)). It is required that all figures of the drawings that are mentioned in the specification are present in the application. The Drawings of Figures 13-14 are included in the application but the Detailed Description fails to construe these figures (MPEP 601.01(g)).  
Cancel Figures 13-17, or appropriate correction is required.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

5. Claims 1-2, 4-14, 16-17, 19-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Marchetti et al., "Integrating Autonomous Enterprise Systems through Dependable CORBA Objects", 3-2001.

Given the broadest reasonable interpretation of followed claims in light of the specification.

As per Claim 1: Marchetti discloses, *"A cross platform administrative framework configured to manage administrative services in a service system, the administrative framework comprising:*

*a system administrative subsystem (Page 205, Figure 2, RUPA) operationally coupled to an administrative service interface (Page 206, left column, lines 1-7) and configured to provide an entry point into the administrative framework and perform at least one administrative function ('Domain') including initialization of administrative services and invocation of at least one service associated with performing administrative services (See page 205, Figure 5, and see page 208, Figure 6, IRL);*

*a data management subsystem, the data management subsystem including at least one device data manager implemented as a layer on a framework-specific database, configured as a persistent service and configured to provide data retrieval and storage functionality, handle all device related data actions (Page 208, Figure 6, PersistenceManager, and last 2 lines in left column and lines 1-12 in right column); and*

*an event service framework configured to enable transmission of events without the supplier of the event being required to know the consumers of the event, wherein the administrative framework is not operating system specific." (Page 208, Figure 6, ObjectGroup, and see left column, in section 3.2, the paragraph started at line 3; see page 210, section 5.2);*

As per Claim 2: Marchetti discloses, *"The administrative framework of claim 1, further comprising a fault detection subsystem including:*

*a fault detector proxy loader component configured to initiate fault detection proxies, monitor the event service system and start up fault detectors; and a fault detector proxy component configured to start up during system startup, control a fault monitoring startup, monitor processor faults and TDM bus faults, communicate these faults to other components in the administrative framework 100 via the event service*

*framework and monitor processor faults when triggered by the system administrative subsystem"* (See page 206, right column, fourth bullet, and page 207, left column, lines 1-12, "DC Gateway").

As per Claim 4: Marchetti discloses, *"The administrative framework of claim 1, further comprising a live insertion and removal subsystem including a live insertion or removal observer configured to manage live, device insertion and removal and notify at least one other component of the administrative framework by sending an event through the event service provided by the event service framework"* (See page 208, left column, section 3.2, particularly, in the left column, referring to "add/remove" replicas to the group").

As per Claim 5: Marchetti discloses, *"The administrative framework of claim 1, wherein the system administration subsystem includes a mechanism to manage both system startup and shutdown, the mechanism being configured to control the event service system"*, because it is provided with backup - for failures or crashes (Page 208, right column, lines 1-12, or by the computer that implements the architecture IRL, because each computer comprises a mechanism to manage both system startup and shutdown).

As per Claim 6: Marchetti discloses, *"The administrative framework of claim 1, wherein the administrative framework uses Common Object Request Broker Architecture as a software backend architecture and Common Object Request Broker Architecture specification standards to create, distribute and manage distributed program objects"* (See Figure 6, "ORB").

As per Claim 7: Marchetti discloses, *"The administrative framework of claim 6, wherein an Object Request Broker manages service requests for a service associated with the administrative framework"* (See Figure 6, ORB interfaced with IRL).

As per Claim 8: Marchetti discloses, *"The administrative framework of claim 1, wherein the administrative framework is configured to provide extensible, generic frameworks to perform administrative functions and architectural mechanisms for administrative software configured to perform at least one of administration, configuration, system initialization, fault monitoring and event notifications in a system for providing at least one service"* (See whole section 3.2 in page 208).

As per Claim 9: Marchetti discloses, *"The administrative framework of claim 1, wherein the administrative framework is configured to provide cross platform solutions for system initialization, configuration,*

*management and fault monitoring for a service system"* (See page 204, right column, second full paragraph, "heterogeneous environment").

As per Claim 10: Marchetti discloses, "*The administrative framework of claim 1, in combination and coupled to an administrative service interface language independent layer configured to use an interface definition language*" (See page 206, left column, section 2.2, "interface language independent", page 210, left column, first bullet in section 5.2, "a set of IDL interfaces").

As per Claim 11: Marchetti discloses, "*The administrative framework of claim 10, wherein the administrative system interface is coupled to at least one language-specific interface including a C++ interface, an eXtensible Markup Language interface, a C interface or a Java interface*", because Object Request Broker is an example of a program that would use the IDL, interface definition language, to "broker" communication between objects and another interface language. The interface language could be any language such as C++.

As per Claim 12: Marchetti discloses the limitation, "*The administrative framework of claim 11, wherein the at least one language-specific interfaces is configured to provide a mechanism for communication between the administrative system interface and a customer administration application*" via the definition of IDL used in CORBA, where administrative system interface (CORBA/another language), and customer administration application (another language/CORBA)).

As per Claim 13: Regarding limitation:

*"An event service system comprising: an administrative framework utilizing CORBA interfaces (See page 208, 'ORB'); an administrative system interface coupled to the administrative framework; at least one language-specific interface coupled to the administrative system interface and configured to provide a mechanism for communication between the administrative system interface and a customer administration application (See page 208, 'IRL');*

*wherein the administrative system interface is configured to enable clients to manage the event service system (See page 208, 'Smart Proxy', 'Client Object')) and wherein the administrative framework includes:*

*a system administrative subsystem operationally coupled to the administrative service interface and configured to provide an entry point into the administrative framework and perform at least one administrative function including initialization of administrative services and invocation of at least one service associated with performing administrative services; a data management subsystem, the data management subsystem including at least one device data manager implemented as a layer on a framework-specific database, configured as a persistent service and configured to provide data retrieval and storage functionality, handle all device related data actions; and an event service framework configured to enable transmission of events without the supplier of the event being required to know the consumers of the event"* (See rationale in Claim 1 above).

As per Claim 14: Regarding, "The event service system of claim 13, wherein the administrative system interface is configured to allow a client to interact with the event service system without dealing with CORBA interfaces utilized by the administrative framework" (See Figure 5, or Figure 6, Client object/ORB).

As per Claim 16: Regarding, "The event service system of claim 13, wherein the administrative framework is coupled to at least one tool from the list consisting of an ORB, Java threads, an XML parser, and a Ramia Database" (Page 206, left column, in section 2.2, lines 5-10, "collection of business objects and components is specified using an appropriate Interface Definition Language": *list consisting of an ORB, Java threads, an XML parser, and a Ramia Database*).

As per Claim 17: Regarding, "The event service subsystem of claim 13, wherein the administrative framework further comprises a fault detection subsystem including: a fault detector proxy loader component configured to initiate fault detection proxies, monitor the event service system and start up fault detectors; and a fault detector proxy component configured to start up during system startup, control a fault monitoring startup, monitor processor faults and TDM bus faults, communicate these faults to other components in the administrative framework via the event service framework and monitor processor faults when triggered by the system administrative subsystem", see rationale in Claim 2.

As per Claim 19: Regarding, "The event service system of claim 13, wherein the administrative framework further comprises a live insertion and removal subsystem including a live insertion or removal observer



configured to manage live, device insertion and removal and notify at least one other component of the administrative framework by sending an event through the event service provided by the event service framework", see rationale in Claim 4.

As per Claim 20: Regarding, "The event service system of claim 13, wherein the system administration subsystem includes a mechanism to manage both system startup and shutdown, the mechanism being configured to control the event service system", see rationale in Claim 5.

As per Claim 21: Regarding, "The event service system of claim 13, wherein the administrative framework maintains system initialization and configuration data", see pages 205-206, section 2.1.

***Allowable Subject Matter***

6. Claims 3, 15 and 18 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

As per Claims 3, 18: Prior art of record, Marchetti, and the cited prior arts of records alone or in combination with Bradley, do not disclose "*further comprising a device detection framework configured to detect devices and store device information in the framework-specific database, the device detection framework including a device detector service, at least one device detector factory and a device detector controller, the device detector service being configured to provide an interface for the detector controller to initiate device detection, the detector service being configured to detect present devices and updating the framework-specific database*", as recited in such manner in Claims 3 and 18.

As per Claim 15: Prior art of record, Marchetti, and the cited prior arts of records alone or in combination with Bradley, do not disclose "*wherein the administrative system interface is configured to provide a mechanism to at least one of specify and retrieve configuration attributes for devices, start and stop the service system and retrieve and specify time slot information*", as recited in such manner in Claim 15.

**Conclusion**

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.  
**French et al.**, EP 1014748 A2, discloses including a server that has a bug-tracker component to access a database.

**Kon et al.**, "Monitoring, Security, and Dynamic Configuration with the dynamicTAO Reflective ORB", ACM, pages: 121-143, 2000

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ted T. Vo whose telephone number is (703) 308-9049. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00AM to 5:30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tuan Q. Dam can be reached on (703) 305-4552. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

TED T. VO

TTV  
Patent Examiner  
Art Unit 2122  
August 1, 2004